Exhibit B

ı	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
2	X
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
4	V.
5	S1 09 cR. 512 (LAP) ABDUWALI ABDUKHADIR
6	MUSE,
7	Defendant.
8	X
9	
10	
11	Fobruary 16, 2011
12	February 16, 2011 10:00 a.m.
13	
14	
15	
16	Before:
17	HON. LORETTA A. PRESKA,
18	District Judge
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES
2	PREET BHARARA
3	United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York
4	BRENDAN MCGUIRE, JEFFREY BROWN, Assistant United States Atternave
5	Assistant United States Attorneys
6	PHILLIP L. WEINSTEIN, ESQ.,
7	FIONA DOHERTY, ESQ., DEIRDRE D. von DORNUM, ESQ.,
8	Attorneys for Defendant 52 Duane Street
9	New York, New York
10	ALSO PRESENT:
11	STEVEN SORRELS, Federal Bureau of Investigation FRANKLIN GARCIA, New York City Police Department
12	BRAD DUCKWORTH, Navel NCIS
13	ABDULAZIZ HUSSEN, Official Somali Interpreter
14	FATIMA DUALEH, Somali Interpreter
15	
16	
17	
18	THE CLERK: United States of America.
19	THE COURT: United States against Muse.
20	Is the government ready?
21	MR. McGUIRE: Yes. Brendan McGuire and Jeffrey Brown
22	for the government.
23	With us at counsel table is Special Agent Steven
24	Sorrels and Detective Franklin Garcia of the Joint Terrorism
25	Task Force and Special Agent Brad Duckworth of the Navel

1	Criminal Investigative Service
2	THE COURT: Good morning friends.
3	And is the defense ready?
4	MS. DOHERTY: We are, your Honor. Fiona Doherty
5	Federal Defenders for Mr. Muse. With me at counsel table are
6	my colleagues Deirdre von Dornum and Phillip Weinstein.
7	Also with us is a Somalian interpreter Fatima Dualeh.
8	Of course, our client at the end, Abduwali Muse.
9	THE COURT: Good morning.
10	Ms. Doherty, have you and your client had adequate
11	time to review the presentence report?
12	MS. DOHERTY: We have.
13	THE COURT: Is there any reason it should not be made
14	part of the record?
15	MS. DOHERTY: No, your Honor.
16	THE COURT: I have the fax which you folks sent in
17	this morning which is agreed upon added to paragraph 16 of the
18	PSR relating to the phone conversation.
19	MS. DOHERTY: That's right, your Honor. And as your
20	Honor knows, there were a dispute between the defense and the
21	government about the translation of the two calls that have
22	been at issue at the sentencing, the August 22 and August 23,
23	2009 calls from the MCC, and to avoid a Fatico hearing the
24	defense and the government decided what would be best is to
25	include both versions of these calls within the PSR and,

1	therefore, we provided to your Honor in bold the proposed
2	addition.
3	THE COURT: Yes.
4	With that change and that agreement, are there any
5	objections to the presentence report?
6	MR. McGUIRE: Not from the government, your Honor.
7	MS. DOHERTY: Your Honor, the defense just has two
8	relatively minor points.
9	THE COURT: Yes.
10	MS. DOHERTY: The first is with respect to paragraph
11	110 of the PSR.
12	THE COURT: Yes.
13	MS. DOHERTY: We just ask that be amended to clearly
14	reflect the fact that the to suicide attempts by our client,
15	Abduwali occurred in June of 2010 and not May.
16	THE COURT: Yes.
17	MS. DOHERTY: There is no dispute about that, your
18	Honor.
19	And also, then, in paragraph 17, the PSR notes that
20	the SAND measures expired in January and we just ask it also be
21	included that our client Abduwali is now in general
22	proposition.
23	THE COURT: Yes, Ma'am.
24	Any other objections to the presentence report?
25	MS. DOHERTY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.		
With respect to the offense level computation, I		
accept the findings of the presentence report set forth at		
paragraphs 58 through 71 which conclude that a total offense		
level of 41 is appropriate, including paragraph 72, and		
actually extending to paragraph 85.		
With respect to the defendant's criminal history, I		
accept the findings of the presentence report set forth at		
paragraphs 86 through 91 that conclude that a criminal history		
category of I is appropriate.		
Ms. Doherty, I have the defendant's sentencing		
submission dated cover letter February 2, I have the		
government's sentencing submission dated February 9 and I have		
the defense reply submission dated February 14.		
I also have letters from victims.		
Are there any additional written materials I should be		
looking at, counsel?		
MR. McGUIRE: Not from the government, your Honor.		
MS. DOHERTY: No, your Honor.		
THE COURT: Thank you.		
Ms. Doherty, would you like to speak on behalf of Mr.		
Muse?		
MS. DOHERTY: Yes, your Honor.		
The defense is asking for a sentence of 27 years in		
this case and we would like to emphasize from the outset that		

nobody here is talking about a lenient sentence. Our client pled guilty pursuant to a plea agreement with a stipulated guideline range of between 27 and 33.75 years, and under the terms of that plea agreement neither party can advocate for a sentence outside the guideline range, so in asking for 27 years the defense is asking for what can only be described as an extraordinarily long sentence, one that is in the high end of sentences imposed around the world for these types of offenses and a sentence that will ring out powerfully to the international community as strong deterrent.

And as in any sentencing proceedings, the primary question here is what sentence is sufficient but not greater than necessary.

Of course, the Second Circuit has made clear that the parsimony principle is the driving force behind any sentencing decision. Accordingly, the many question for the court is what is the incremental value of the additional seven years that the government is seeking here. Why is an extra seven years necessary for this sentence to be experienced as both deterrent and specific punishment?

It is our position that a sentence of 27 years is amply sufficient to punish and deter our client. No more time is necessary.

And I think in evaluating how our client will experience these 27 years, the court should consider a number

of very important factors.

First, his age. And although I will come back to the specific of the age question later on, no matter how the court views it, there is really no doubt, no dispute that he is very young, and that is true whether the court accepts the defense's position that he was 16 at the time of the offense or relies on the statements that were made to Detective Gallaway shortly after the offense that he was between 18 and 19.

And, of course, when he made those statements he just witnessed his three companions getting killed, he was shackled, he was very different and chaotic circumstances, and a sentence of 27 years is a very harsh punishment against somebody who was clearly so young.

Now, in the context of deterrence, the government actually uses his young age against him by pointing out that he will still be relatively young when he is released from prison.

But, your Honor, if you run the numbers, he will be in his mid-40s at the end of the 27 year sentence, and the court can't evaluate this in a vacuum. The government says maybe he will turn to piracy doesn't say anything about the actual operation of piracy in Somalia. When he gets out in 27 years the whole landscape in Somalia will be difference.

In considering the need for deterrence the court should consider the life expectancy figures from Somolia. The latest figure from the World Bank shows life expectancy for a

man in Somolia is 48 years.

I have the documents if you want to support it. I already shared these with the government. He will be in middle 40s on a 27 year sentence. Somebody might argue he will be held here in the United States, those life expectancies figures don't hold up in Mr. Muse's position.

There is no doubt the conditions in Somolia that he experienced up until he was arrested will continue to have a powerful effect on him. It's beyond dispute the childhood malnutrition continues to have an enduring health affect as someone goes older. And when you are talking about Somalia, you are not just talking about malnutrition, you are talking about severe acute malnutrition as identified in the U.N. report indicted by the defendant. The body doesn't get the nutrition it needs to develop properly.

And I think sort of a clear indication to the court of the health effects that Abduwali will face is evidenced in the treatment that he has gotten so far at the MCC, the dental treatment. BOP has already removed seven of his teeth and identified two more that need to be extracted, and the decay of teeth is a clear symptom of childhood malnutrition.

And the life expectancy figures also raise other important issues. For woman in Somalia it's 51, for men in Somalia it's 48, which means after 27 years there is practically no chance that his parents will be alive when he

gets returned to Somolia.

Even for his siblings and his friends, they will be edging up against those life expectancy figures after a sentence of 27 years, and this is all to say why is a significant a sentence of 27 years, why that provides enough punishment and deterrence in this case.

A sentence of 27 years is much more extreme given Abduwali's situation as a Somalian raised under these conditions and it's much more severe and it is much more extreme than a sentence that might be imposed on an American where the life expectancy here is 76. That is almost a 30 year difference, your Honor.

Next I would like to move on to the issue of the alleged threat from the MCC, specifically, the issue of the two phone calls that Abduwali made to Somolia on August 22 August 23, 2009.

The government imposed special administrative measures on Abduwali for a year on the basis of its interpretation of those calls. He was kept in isolation in a small room, no religious services, no TV, no radio, severely limited access to books. And although the government doesn't address the issue of the calls a great deal in the submission, the PSR obviously contains a lot of information on that and we would like to address the issue of the calls head on.

Now, the chain of events that resulted in the SAND

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

measure began when a manned name Gilbert Victor, who was a hired captain of the boat Serenity told the FBI after two months before his -- he told the FBI about two months before his release he heard that Abduwali had sent --THE COURT: From being held as a hostage? MS. DOHERTY: Yes, your Honor, absolutely. Mr. Victor was a member of the crew of the Serenity that was hijacked about a month or so before the Maersk Alabama, and what Victor told the FBI was that about two months before his release he had heard that Abduwali had sent a message from the MCC instructing that the captain of a different ship, the Win Far 161 be killed. Now, all of Abduwali's calls from the MCC and identified two calls from August 2009 that they thought were consistent with Gilbert's account, and in those two calls Abduwali was talking to his mother and he told his mother he made a promise when he was in Salat and he wanted this promise to be fulfilled. We spent a lot of time in our submission explaining howl the evidence surrounding these calls does not match up to how the government has interpreted them. I think one of the most significant issues is the timing of these two calls, because the timing of the calls in late August 2009 doesn't match up with Victor's account.

Victor said that he had heard about this threat in

mid-July of 2009 which was five weeks before the calls that the government is relying on were actually made. Thus, purely as a matter of timing the calls relied upon by the government could not have been the source of the threat.

As we explain in our submission, the calls did not concern the captain of the Win Far 161 in any way. The calls were about a promise and we will go into heavy detail here that we talk about in our submissions, but the calls were about a promise that Abduwali made to a man of a different clan concerning a promise to buy a car in exchange for services that Abduwali had provided that man in Somalia who was aware of it and Abduwali wanted to fulfill the promise and in the calls he is asking his mother not to interfere with them.

And our explanation of the calls is supported by a number of important concrete factors.

First, the text of the calls themselves. Your Honor has those both in the PSR and in our submission. They reflect the fact that the promise was made back when Abduwali was in Somolia and before his capture by the U.S. Abduwali never returned to Somolia after the capture of the Win Far so he could not be discussing a promise about the Win Far when he was in Somolia so the text just doesn't watch up.

Also Abduwali's mother and younger brother independently confirmed to the defense that these calls were about a car. And your Honor has an affirmation from Mohamad,

Exhibit G, talking about all that.

And also we provided the court with a separate recording from the MCC which made explicit that that there was a promise concerning Abduwali. That was what the promise was about. And, of course, the captain of the Win Far was not harmed.

Now, it's also significant that the government view of the alleged threat relies on the account of one witness, and that's Mr. Victor, the captain of the Serenity. And what do we know about Mr. Victor?

Well, we know a number of things. And we talked about this in our submission. I will just highlight the issues here, but he has significant credibility problems, reputation for drug smuggling, he lied to the FBI about who was on the Serenity. He was under active investigation in the case shells about what he was doing during the actual voyage from the Seychelles to Madagascar that is at issue in this case.

But, again, even if the court were to accept Gilbert's account, the timing and the story just doesn't match up.

Victor's owe account doesn't match the timing of the calls. So there is no accurate reliable evidence that the court can use on the basis of those calls to use those calls to increase Abduwali's sentence by seven years. That's why that is significant here.

I also would like to address the issue of leadership,

your Honor, because in the government's submission they rely heavily on the fact that Abduwali played a leadership role.

THE COURT: I thought that was stipulated to.

MS. DOHERTY: You are right, your Honor, we do not dispute in any way that Abduwali was the leader of the four men or acted as the leader of the four men who took the Maersk Alabama or tried to take the Maersk Alabama. But he is already being punished extensively for that leadership role.

The stipulated guideline range includes a four level enhancement for leadership which increases his offense level from level 37 to 41. At offense level 37, which he would be at if there were no leadership points, his guideline range would be 210 to 262 months, in other words, 17.5 to 21 years. So because of his leadership, the guideline range is bumped up by ten years. That's already a significant punishment and gives no cause for the court to go to the top of the guideline range just to reflect his leadership, it is already amply reflected in the guidelines.

And in the government's submission they express Abduwali's leadership role too far and it is not supported by the evidence.

On page 21 of their submission the government claims that essentially everything concerning the hijacking of the Serenity, the Win Far 161 and the Maersk Alabama was executed "under the direction of one man."

This flies in the face of the expert report that the defense provided to the court from Professor Cassanelli, who is a faculty member of the University of Pennsylvania and also directs that university's Center of African Studies.

In this report Dr. Cassanelli makes abundantly clear that modern day piracy in Somolia relies on network supply and financing that go way beyond what happens actually happens in operations at sea and high-level organizers are not anywhere near the actual operation, they leave that entire hand to get a tiny cut of the proceeds. That is the landscape of the actual piracy operations that are working in Somolia.

In its submission the government also attempts to impute to Abduwali's leadership events that took place many months after his capture when he was at the MCC.

For example, I don't think this is necessarily clear from the government's submission, but Win Far 161 was captured just two days before the attempted seizure of the Maersk Alabama so Abduwali was involved in that for only two days, but the Win Far was then held for approximately ten months in Somolia before being released, but in discussing what happened during these ten months the government repeatedly refers to actions by Muse. At that time Abduwali is here. They can't impute things that happened while he was here to actions that occurred in Somolia.

In asking for a sentence of 27 years the defense has

asked the court to consider a number of factors.

His age, the sanctioning of piracy among officials in Puntland where he lives, his desperate conditions prevailing in Somolia, including the conditions he experienced when he grew up, and also the mental health problems that he experienced in BOP custody.

I know I put a lot of that in our submission so I would like to highlight a few issues here and respond to some of the government's arguments.

On the question of age, there are no birth records in Somolia after 20 years of Civil War. What we tried to do is provide the court with the next best thing. We provided affirmations from his family, specifically from his mother and his brother Mohamad where they clearly say he was 16 at the time of the offense.

We also provided an affirmation from a man called Akeem Al Ben Mohammed, and that man is a BBC journalist in punt land, and he was hired by the defense, he worked for the defense as an investigator and an interpreter in Somolia. He makes clear and he has met Mohamad, Abduwali's younger brother, in person and he makes clear, yes, he seems to be somebody, he looks like somebody who is 16 or 17 years old. Mohamad is one year younger than Abduwali. Given this, Abduwali is approximately 18 years old now, two years after the offense. All of that matches up.

In choosing to believe that Abduwali is 18 or 19 years old, the government is choosing among contradictory statements that were made immediately after the offense and it's also, of course, relying on the preliminary age hearing that was conducted by Magistrate Judge Peck.

But Judge Peck's ruling was not a determinative finding on age, that was an issue that was made -- that was a finding that was made at the presentment, a finding that needed to be made on the spot because there was an immediate issue whether the presentment should be open to the public, so it's wasn't a final decision in any sense.

THE COURT: My understanding was that the defense did not contest that finding for purposes of the plea.

MS. DOHERTY: That is absolutely right, your Honor.

This was an active issue on the table even after the presentment, but then because of the plea the defense effectively agreed to waive the issue of age for the plea, but as the government knows, the defense reserves the right to present arguments about age to your Honor.

Now, I want to talk very quickly about that age hearing, because the government makes a lot -- takes a lot of significance from the fact that the father made contradictory statements and Abduwali didn't testify, but I think that the government's arguments don't possibly reflects the chaotic environment of my recollection.

My colleagues, Mr. Weinstein and von Dornum, had met Abduwali for the first time about half an hour before the hearing. He was injured, in pain, he spoke Mufti, not English.

No person in their right mind, no lawyer in their right mind would put a client on the stand under those circumstances.

Also with regard to the contradictory statement or one contradictory statement by the father, it is also important for the court to understand the circumstances under which that testimony was given. The father obviously was not in the courtroom, it was done by a telephone line to Somolia. There is no written record of what he actually said in Somolia, you only have the translator's English version and she repeatedly indicate had she was having trouble hearing. You can see it. Even Judge Peck acknowledged that the father could easily have misunderstood the question, so that is not a determinative finding in any way.

But I think the main point to draw from all of this is no matter what the court decides about how old he is, 16 or 18 or 19 at the time of the offense, he's very young. There is no question about that. And that's also supported by the dental records from the MCC that we talk about in their submission. We just ask that the court take those things into account.

We also ask the court to consider the economic conditions in Somolia, the malnutrition, hunting through the garbage for food, working from the age of eight, living

independently without adults from the age of 11, the kind of story that really is not imaginable here in the United States. Without education, no support, hunger. These are the things and the only things that drove him to get involved in the conduct in this case. And we ask that the court evaluate all of that in connection with what we know about the conditions in Somolia.

We used a lot of United Nations reports in our submissions to establish to the court the terrible drought and malnutrition that are prevalent in Somolia. It's the worse failed state of all failed states. It's led one policy magazine fail state index now for three years running, and it's the kind of place where children regularly work from an early age, where children regularly are conscripted into the armed forces to be part of the conflict. It's a brutal place for someone to grow up.

And another important point for the defense is the official sanctioning of piracy in Somolia, and for that we presented to the court Professor Cassanelli's report. While piracy is clearly illegal under international and United States law, there is a very different governmental attitude about piracy in Puntland. There is official sanctioning, complicity and local officials taking part of the proceeds as payment. So it's not experienced in the same way in Puntland as it would be here in the United States.

And this is really getting to our last point, your Honor, and all of this is about why a sentence of 27 years is sufficient, sufficient in this case, but our last point is mental health, the mental health problems.

And your Honor has a report from Dr. Crowle about the mental health problems that Abduwali incurred at the MCC, particularly over the last year when he was isolated in SAND.

And, of course, for Abduwali that is compounded BY the complete isolation, being cut off from anything he has ever known. I mean, it's a completely foreign institutional environment, separated from family, from friends and just being isolated, I think, in a way that an American maybe can't even understand.

And as the court is aware, Abduwali made several suicide attempts in June of 2010, and during those suicide attempts and even after he was experiencing auditory and visual hallucinations and he couldn't distinguish between those hallucinations and reality, and all of that is documented in the MCC medical records.

And this is important because it expresses what Abduwali has experienced in his almost two years of incarceration in BOP custody and he has experienced this as incredible punishment and deterrence already and we think it's very important that the court take that into account.

Dr. Crowle has diagnosed Abduwali with depressive disorder, severe TTFC and anxiety disorder. He talks about the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

profound distress that Abduwali has experienced. And, of course, these incredibly painful episodes for Abduwali have enduring effect on his mental health and that is talked about by Dr. Crowle as well. Although Abduwali very recently is back in general population, his experiences is, again, cut off from his culture, his family, will continue to be very painful for him. So we ask that the court consider all of these factors in deciding what sentence is sufficient but not greater than necessary in this case. Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Doherty. Mr. Muse, would you like to speak on your own behalf? THE DEFENDANT (Through the interpreter): Yes. THE COURT: Yes, sir. Would you do so now, please. THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I'm sorry, I'm sorry very much about what happened, and what happened to the victims who are in the ship. I am very, very sorry about that. Also what happened to them. I am very, very sorry about what I caused and all of that was due because of the problems that exist in Somolia. From the time I was born until the time I was captured I have

I am very, very sorry about what I caused and all of that was due because of the problems that exist in Somolia.

From the time I was born until the time I was captured I have never encountered these people who teach me something or people who tell me something, and I was recruited by people who were more powerful and more intelligent than me. I had the brains

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to execute, but I did not have the brain to organize. I got my hands into something that was more powerful than me and I have been sorry for what I caused, for what I did for the past two years, and even now it's possible that's what going to happen to me I'll never be ordinary, and I'm very, very sorry about that, and I ask for forgiveness to all the people that I harmed and also the U.S. Government. I ask for forgiveness. That's all I would like to say. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Does the government wish to be heard? MR. McGUIRE: Yes, your Honor. We would like to just offer principally three points in response to the defense's argument. First, so we are all clear, the defendant sits before the court today for sentencing for one reason and one reason alone, his choices and his actions. When he and his men attempted to hijack the Maersk Alabama and the crew heroically resisted them, he as the leader of that group could have chosen to leave and return to the Win Far, the other ship that he had hijacked. When the crew, after capturing him, agreed to release him in exchange for Captain Phillips, rather than reneging on

when the crew, after capturing him, agreed to release him in exchange for Captain Phillips, rather than reneging on that agreement and taking Captain Phillips hostage for another four days, the defendant could have agreed, let Captain Phillips return to the Maersk Alabama and he and his men return

to Somolia or the Win Far on the lifeboat.

And when the Navy showed up and he was in the shadow of the Navy destroyer in the lifeboat with Captain Phillips, he, again, could have chosen so surrender. These are his choices, he was the leader and he chose not to.

To the defense's point about the structure of piracy-related operations, there was no mention by the defendant over the course of a six weeks of these three hijackings and certainly no mention during the four days of negotiations with the U.S. Navy of any boss, of anyone that he had to report to, of anyone's approval he needed to let the captain go. He repeatedly boasted that he was the leader and that these were his decisions.

Today he has to face the consequences of those choices and he should be held to full account for his actions.

Secondly, the defendant's conduct in this case is simply put horrific. The government has detailed it to a great degree in the sentencing submission so I will not go through it again for the court. His actions speak for themselves and it is clear the trauma that they have caused is impossible to measure.

The principal reason for that is not simply the actions themselves, because in this case the defendant not only committed these actions, he reveled in them, he relished in the suffering of his victims, whether it was playing Russian

roulette with them, whether it was threatening to cut one of them up and sell his organs or whether it was assembling an IED in front OF them and planting it in front of a hostage and threatening to detonate it if they were discovered.

None of this was necessary for the defendant's overall objective, which was a ransom payment. This was all just done for the sake of it, seemingly for his own and his men men's enjoyment. He could have achieved the same effect without any of this and without simply telling -- by simply telling those who he was negotiating with in fact he was doing this but he need not actually have done it, but he did it and he seemed to relish it.

And in addition when he was caught, when he was arrested, he was unrepentant. When asked what happened after waiving his Miranda rights, he lied to the interviewing agent and he told him he was forced to do it at gunpoint by other men.

And then, of course, as defense commented on at length, there are the calls from the MCC in which, as the defense concedes, whatever the interpretation may be, he continued to engage in piracy related activity from the MCC.

The effects of his acts have proven unbearable for many of the victims and, of course, they are multiplied out to the victims' families. For many their effects will no doubt be both profound and lasting and certainly it appears for many

those effects will last beyond 27 years, 33.75 years or whatever sentence the defendant receives because it appears that a number of these individuals will suffer for the rest of their lives.

Thirdly and finally, the defendant's conduct here completely dwarfs any arguments made in mitigation by the defense, whether individually or in the aggregate. None of what the defense is arguing justifies a sentence at the bottom end of the guideline range here.

As to the issue of age, again, the government addresses this in its memo. The defendant has used his youthful appearance as a tool for leniency since the moment he was arrested that's why he provided multiple ages.

Magistrate Judge Peck found that the defendant was a adult. For the last nearly two years while this case has been pending before your Honor he has been prosecuted as an adult. His conduct makes clear that he is an adult and today he should be held to account as an adult for the consequences of his actions.

Finally, the defense makes some suggestion in their initial papers and then they press the argument in their reply papers that notwithstanding the fact that the Navy allowed the defendant to surrender on April 12, notwithstanding the fact that the U.S. Government employed every resource it had in order to attempt to achieve a peaceful resolution to the crisis

caused by the defendant and notwithstanding the fact that the Navy employed the assistance much Somolia elders, the defense suggests and presses in its reply brief that, in fact, the three men, Muse's three men had agreed to surrender and when they did that the Navy shot them anyway.

This argument is outrageous. It is outrageous. It flies in the face of the evidence and it defies common sense.

The defendant and his men forced the U.S. Navy to be heroes that day and heroes they were and that was it, plain and simple.

The breadth and the depth of the suffering that this man has caused is extraordinary. 53 men from six countries over the course of six weeks crossed his path. They were victimized hundreds of miles out at see isolated from what they knew simply because they were trying to do their jobs. And as I mentioned earlier, the suffering is multiplied because of the trauma that has now been experienced by all of their family members.

He was the leader. He was the first one on board. It will be his face that they remember. It will be his voice that they hear and it will be his laugh that will haunt them.

The sentence today, your Honor, not only needs to reflect the seriousness of his offenses, not only needs to reflect the need to protect the public from this man, but it also needs to reflect the need for general deterrence in this

area, and respectfully the government submits the sentence in this case should send an unmistakable message to anyone who would considered attacking an American ship or praying on defenseless American sailors.

For all of those reasons, a sentence at the bottom end of the applicable guideline range is simply insufficient and the government respectfully requests that the court sentence the defendant at the top end of the guideline range to a sentence of 405 months.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Mcguire.

Ms. Doherty, would you like to respond?

MS. DOHERTY: Yes. A couple of points that the government raised, one, being that Abduwali in the moments he was taken particularly into custody was unrepentant and gave a false statement.

I think the court could evaluate the circumstance under which that statement was made. He was terrified. He had just witnessed his three companions getting killed and he felt that given the circumstances of what he experienced at the shooting he couldn't trust them at that point to tell the truth, but now he has said exactly what happened and he has taken responsibility for his role in the context of what happened on the Maersk Alabama.

Also I just want to respond briefly to the

government's point about how Abduwali experienced the shooting of his three companions and his belief that they were in the process of surrendering when they were killed.

The defense presses this issue in response to the government's argument in its reply memorandum so the court could see that we were by no means pulling any of this out of thin air and there is evidence that an agreement had been reached and that the three men had agreed with Abduwali to release the captain, and one of the things we presented to the court was an affirmation by Serion, who is the Somali elder that the Navy reached out to discuss coming, really to have the authority be involved in the peaceful resolution of this. And Mr. Weinstein and I traveled to Africa and we personally met with Serion and he gave us this account which is now reflected in the affidavit and that is that his understanding was that the men had agreed to be released without condition.

Whether all of this is relevant, I think it is only relevant to the extent Abduwali's experiences of all of this, how he understood and the interpreted the shooting of the men, how terrified he was and how that, too, is powerful punishment and deterrence as experienced by our client.

Thank your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ladies and gentlemen, I understand there are victims present who wish to be heard.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

25

Would you come forward, ladies and gentlemen, to the podium. Would you state your name clearly and then I am happy to listen to what you have to say. Sir. MR. WRIGHT: My name is Cullin Wright and I was the third officer on board the Maersk Alabama during the hijacking. THE COURT: Yes, sir. MR. WRIGHT: I would like to say what happened to us was terrible and it has changed me. I'm not the same person 10 that I used to be and I never will be. 11 I would like to say that the defendant was the leader 12 of the group. He was the first person aboard to hold us at 13 gunpoint on the bridge. I was forced to go down and lower 14 ladder so the rest of the other two pirates could come aboard 15 the whole time at gunpoint. 16 They shot at us and at me from the boat on to the ship 17 and bullets RANG off the bulkhead right next to me. It's a 18 very, very scary experience. 19 Now, during the time that we spent on board there were 20 three of us on the bridge, the captain and ATF Raffer, which is 21 an AB, and I was on the bridge being held the entire time. The 22 rest of the crew were at the steering room and they barricaded 23 themselves in there and it was very hot. We are near the 24 equator and at the steering was approximately 130 degrees, 140

degrees. Now, these men stayed in that at the steering room

for about eight hours and by the time them got out they were bearing able to walk and the experience for them was very traumatizing.

The defendant and his three companions had many chances to leave the ship. They were given the money from the safe and they had an opportunity to leave the ship and leave us to go on our way. They would not do that.

After our crew captured the defendant and made the deal to exchange the captain for the defendant, there was a goods chance for them to go off and we would not have been able to catch them. Instead, they took our captain and we were forced to get our ship operational in a very short time with every man in very bad shape, barely able to walk, but we were able to chase the lifeboat with our captain for seven hours and able to corral the lifeboat so it could not get away and get out of our sight.

It took nearly eight hours for the Navy to arrive after we had gotten the pirates off of the ship. So the whole time very, very bad, but the crew was able to work through it and I believe we saved our captain from going off into the night.

Now, it was pretty bad. I was told before I went to the ship that we would stay at least 300 miles off the coast of Somolia. There were already attacks that were happening, they were all pretty close a hundred, 200 miles off the coast of

Somolia. When our ship was captured, we were 230 miles off the coast. Captain Phillips had been aboard approximately a week and in that time he had had at least seven e-mails telling him to stay 600 miles off the coast of Somolia. He did not do that. Also when he took over from the previous captain, that captain told him you should say 600 miles off the coast of Somolia.

So the captain, for his reasons, put us in a very bad situation, and as counsel stated, defenseless. We have pocket knives and fire hoses to combat pirates, and since then on the Alabama they have put a secure team, but for the other Maersk ships that travel through that area, they don't have any security.

I was on a ship last year that went through that area. We had a military cargo on board. They put four security personnel when we got to the Red Sea. We delivered our cargo in the Persian Gulf and as soon as the cargo was off they took the security off. We're still in pirate waters without any security, and I just wonder was the security for the cargo or for the men. Also they disabled the firearms on board when they left.

I believe there are still nevertheless 700 crew members being held captive by the pirates and our security has not been imposed very much since the event and I would like to see something done about that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Counsel has said that a lenient sentence is in order because of his upbringing and malnutrition. I don't believe that is true. I think he needs to serve the extra seven years in an American prison where he can have proper food. He also may need seven additional years for his mental illness to be treated. And we're not talking only about piracy that he has done, he is responsible for the deaths of his three companions. 27 years is a very light sentence for that and I believe 34 years is a light sentence, also, but I believe that's your parameter. I would ask the court to impose the heaviest sentence possible. He has changed the lives of everybody that he came across in those six weeks. Thank you. THE COURT: That you, Mr. Wright. Who else would like to be heard, ladies and gentlemen? (Pause) Anyone else? (Pause) Everyone sure? (Pause) Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Muse comes before the court to be sentenced for

hijacking a ship, conspiracy to hijack three ships, hostage taking, conspiracy to engage in hostage taking and conspiracy to engage in kidnapping.

I am cognizant that Mr. Muse did not plead to Count 1, the piracy count that carries a mandatory life sentence. He was also permitted not to plead to Counts 4, 7 and 10, the counts relating to possession of machine guns in connection with a crime of violence which also carry mandatory consecutive life sentences.

His guidelines calculations does not take into account the hijackings of the Serenity and the Win Far 161 for purposes of calculating his total offense level and, thus, as noted in the presentence report at page 35 Muse has already been afforded some leniency in this case.

Now, of course, the guidelines, as you know, ladies and gentlemen, I have calculated the guidelines and have taken them into account.

In looking at the history and characteristics of the defendant, of course, thanks to the defense submission I am cognizant of the defendant's upbringing and of the economic conditions and the other conditions that Ms. Doherty mentioned in her presentation.

I do note, however, the letter of Heather Cronan, the wife of John Cronan, who was the third engineer on the Maersk Alabama. She writes:

Mr. Muse, it is not my family's fault that we were born in this country and you were born in yours. I always had deep sympathy for Somolia, its people and the horrendous difficulties your families are forced through no fault of your own to endure. I have preyed for the people of Somolia and supported those charities that directly provided assistance to you and your people. But the unimaginable struggles the people of Somolia face every day are not my fault. My family did nothing to you, yet you attacked the Maersk Alabama, my husband and our family.

I also take into account the government's rendition of the various opportunities that Mr. Muse had to turn back from this course during the course of the facts.

I also note, as I set out in detail in the papers, the previous hijackings, the other hijackings which this defendant has engaged in.

In connection with his history and characteristics, I also take into account the stipulated fact and the fact which Mr. Wright noted that this defendant was the leader of this organized gang of pirates.

I take into account, of course, the nature and circumstances of the crime. And, again, I am cognizant that technically the defendant did not plead to the piracy count.

I do note, however, the extraordinary nature of the underlying conduct here. As Professor Kenneth Randell, of the

University of Alabama has explained, prosecution of piracy is one of the few items that all nations agree on under what is known as the universality principle. Piracy is an offense that any state can define and punish because pirates have long been considered the enemies of all humanity. Because of this universal concern any state may prosecute piracy regardless of the sites of the offense, the nationality of the offender and the offended. Our Constitution specifically authorizes

Congress "to define and punish piracy committed on the high seas."

And it is that extraordinary conduct that is the subject of this sentencing.

As pointed out in part of the government's submission, the gang of men who violently and mythology seized control of the Maersk Alabama and other vessels were experienced, coordinated and ruthless in the practice of hijacking, robbery and hostage taking. They were skilled seamen who understood how to track and approach larger vessels from their speed boats. They were comfortable firing and handling AK 47 machine guns.

There is no doubt that the pirates were armed as Mr.
Wright pointed out. The crew members of the Maersk Alabama
said so in interviews with some of the folks present here and
the Navy recovered two loaded AK 47 assault rifles, two gun
straps each containing three AK 47 magazines and one magazine

for a handgun from the lifeboat that Captain Phillips was held in.

The men who undertook these actions understood how to board and then commandeer various types of target vessels quickly and efficiently. They did not hesitate to beat, injury and shot at their hostages. They were willing to hold their captives for months and they refused to surrender even having been given numerous opportunities to do so.

Their approach was premeditated, organized and relentless. As has been stipulated to by the defendant and his lawyers, he was the leader of that band of pirates.

The pirates' owe conduct made clear that they were not merely robbing crew members to support themselves. As Mr. Wright pointed out, they were given the funds in the Maersk Alabama's save, which I understood to be some \$30,000. But that wasn't enough. There's was a far more ambitious and lucrative objective, multi-million dollar ransom payments in exchange for the lives of crew members. They were committed to holding on to their dozens of hostages for as long as was necessary to get paid even if the hostages died as a result.

Indeed, the presentence report notes that Mr. Muse said to Captain Phillips that he was looking for a multi-million dollar ransom and observed if the ransom was only a few million dollars for the captain, that wasn't worth it and he rather kill the captain than accept that amount.

The extreme level of violence and sadism that Mr. Muse and his men employed, which, as the government points out, was almost all entirely unnecessary to his demands for ransom, demonstrates that Mr. Muse and his men were not, as he suggests, halfhearted participants conscripted into service by hunger or other duress; they appeared to relish even their most depraved acts of physician and psychological violence and abandoned all pretense of humane treatment of their captives.

As we know and as the presentence report details,
Captain Phillips was held in the lifeboat for several days and
Mr. Muse and his crew physically assaulted him and conducted a
mock execution of him. They repeatedly threatened to kill him.

At one point when Captain Phillips began to chew on the ropes tied around his wrists and his legs, a pirate stuck a stick inside Captain Phillips mouth and after doing it Mr. Muse called the captain Stick Mouth and shined a flashlight into his mouth to make sure the stick stayed in place.

At one point when the captain tried to escape the lifeboat by jumping into the water, another of the pirates shot at him until he surrendered.

The next day Mr. Muse told personnel on the U.S. S
Bainbridge that "we are going to punish him now, we are going
to tie him," and so they did, binding his hands and feet and
tying his hands to the side of the lifeboat.

Mr. Muse also accused Captain Phillips of being dirty

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and performed a religious ritual involving ropes that caused the captain to believe that he was going to die. Mr. Muse told the captain at that time that he was going to bury him in a shallow area of the ocean because he, the captain, was dirty, and then he said to Captain Phillips, "Not tonight, tomorrow night." The captain understood that Mr. Muse meant that he was going to be killed the following night. At some point one of the pirates hit Captain Phillips in the head so hard that he thought he had been shot in the head and, of course, he started to bleed as a result of that. As the government noted in its presentation, the extraordinary nature of this offense extends to the trauma caused to the various victims. For example, in his letter dated January 22, 2011, Captain Phillips says, "I am writing this letter on behalf of all American mariners, American as well as my fellow brothers and sisters sailing on all the flags of the world." He continues: The mariners of the world have to deal with piracy with limited means and assistance. He talks about some of the areas and he says, it

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

affects us in our daily lives and it is not a Disneylandesque

lives repeatedly, they shot at us, they deprive us of rights

problem. These are not Johnny Depps. They threaten seamen's

that they themselves complain about. They assault us, deny us food, water and have a general disregard for mariners. They terrorize mariners with mock killings, telling us that they will kill us tomorrow, next week, in an hour. They have killed people. Many people could be killed while they attempt to take over one of our ships. I was almost hit on three different occasions by their rifle fire. They have no compunction with beating people to bending them to their ways and be subservient.

He continues:

Most pirates are on a catch and release program.

There is no punishment if they are caught. We must accept as a legal system the burden of punishing these pirates as many countries do not.

Not all Somolians are pirates. These pirates choose their way of life with total disregard to their victims. They threaten to kill me on multiple occasions. They put weapons in my face with sneers on their faces, they slapped and hit me multiple times. This person was their leader and he just does not care about others. They held a gun to my head and pulled the trigger repeatedly to try and control me.

My family had to endure the five days worrying and wondering what was going to happen and he was just as much a terrorist to them as to me.

I ask not for revenge or brutality, only for justice

for me, my family and my fellow sailors who ply the world's waters and abide by the world's laws. He has had his days in court. When do the victims get theirs?

I note the letter of John Cronan, also a crew member on the Maersk Alabama. He writes:

I have been a United States merchant marine for 28 years. I have sailed to all parts of the world and under a wide range of conditions. Until April 8, 2009 I never once feared for my life. I am not a soldier, I never desired to be a soldier, I just want to go to work and provide for my family.

He goes on:

I was simply doing an honest day's work when you, Mr. Muse, chose to climb the side of my ship armed with automatic weapons knowing my shipmates and I were unarmed. We were delivering food aid for your people. You boarded the Maersk Alabama shooting at us.

He goes on to talk about the 130 degree heat that Mr. Wright told us about.

He says, I looked into the faces of my shipmates and feared some of them would not survivor the horrible smothering heat and I preyed to my God that I would not be one of them. I held my daughter's pictures in the dark praying I would have the opportunity to tell them how much I loved them one more time.

He continues:

As a result of PTSD for the first time in my life I am unable to return to work and unable to provide for my family.

All of this pails to the effect your actions have had on my children. I have held them in the middle of the night when they had nightmares about you.

He said, we captured you, we captured you and it is my conviction that we treated you better than you would have treated us. You gave no regard for me or my family, yet my shipmates and I treated your wound. We gave you food and water. In return you took our captain and left us to chase you still unarmed for many hours.

Mr. Cronan's wife Heather, whom I referred to earlier, notes that since returning from the Alabama my husband has suffered tremendously with post-traumatic stress disorder.

Most nights he does not sleep and on the nights he does I have learned to wake him from his nightmares with my feet to avoid being struck in the face as he lashes out at pirates in his sleep.

Our youngest daughter still has nightmares and has experienced fear that Mr. Muse will somehow escape from prison and come searching for her.

She continues:

Our family has been financially devastated by Mr. Muse and his colleagues. My husband, a lifelong merchant seaman, is still unable to return to work. John's income as an engineer

represented more than half our total household income. As a result of John's unexpected loss of income, my home was lost to foreclosure. The out-of-pocket costs paid to various therapist to help our family heal has totaled to date in the thousands of dollars.

Mr. Cronan's daughters write -- Annie writes, I was 12 years old when you attacked the Maersk Alabama. My sister was nine. My sister and I woke up that morning hearing our mom crying. We were confused and scared. My mom tried to tell us everything was going to be okay, but the look in her eyes made us know this was serious. We never thought anything could happen to our parents. My sister has nightmares and I sleep in her room because she is too scared to sleep by herself since the attack. Our stepdad is sad so much now.

She goes on:

We don't understand why you would steal from a ship that was delivering food to your country.

I note the letter from Kelley Baughman Fisher, who is the wife of first assistant engineer Matthew Fisher.

Ms. Fisher is also a merchant mariner working as an engineer aboard U.S. flagged oil tankers so she knows where of she speaks.

She says, my husband came home from the Alabama in April of 2009 a changed man. While he did not suffer from the more physically apparent symptoms of PTSD as some of the crew

did, his personality and actions began to change. Our marriage began to deteriorate though I did not realize it until it was too late to save it. We are in the process of divorcing right now.

I have become close with a number of the crew members of the Alabama and their families in the past year and a half.

I have seen these friends go through incredible hardships through the attack, mental, physical, emotional and financial.

We turn to each other through these problems because there are very few people in this country who can understand what we went through and what we continue to go through as a result of the attack on the Alabama.

And so, ladies and gentlemen, I take into account the history and characteristics of this defendant and the nature and circumstances of the offense.

Moving to the paragraph 2 factors under Section 3553(a), I think it is apparent by now that a lengthy sentence is required to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law and to provide just punishment for such an extraordinary offense.

Paragraph B discusses the need to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct.

The presentence report points out that the March 16, 2009 report of the Secretary General of the United Nations to the United Nations Security Council addressed the threat that

piracy and armed robbery at sea pose to the security of international navigation off the coast of Somolia. According to the report, in 2008 there were 111 reported incidents of piracy or armed robbery at sea against ships off the coast of Somolia. The report states that this number constitutes an annual increase of nearly 200 percent when compared to the number of reported incidents in 2007.

The report also states that by the end of 2008 one group of pirates based in Somolia was believed to have earned approximately \$30 million in ransom payments.

And I take into account that this report was in 2007 and 2008. That would be the year before the events at issue here.

This documented enormous increase in the reporting incidents of piracy or armed robbery at sea emphasizes the importance of general deterrence as a sentencing factor here. Indeed, I think it is fair to say that general deterrence of this type of conduct is the most important sentencing factor brought to bear in this case.

Of course, paragraph C talks about the need to protect the public from further crimes of this defendant.

I am cognizant of the points made by Ms. Doherty in her sentencing submission and in her presentation today about the need to protect the public from crimes of this defendant, and I'm also, of course, cognizant of her argument that a

sentence above the lower end of the guideline range is greater than what is necessary to meet the sentencing factors, especially the factors of deterrence.

I disagree there and, indeed, it is this marked uptick in piracy and armed robbery at sea and the need to deter other individuals from undertaking this kind of conduct that counsels for the higher sentence and which makes the higher sentence absolutely necessary to fulfill the sentencing factors.

The other factors listed in paragraph 3553(a)(2) are not particularly relevant here and carry virtually no weight in contrast to the need for general deterrence here.

Accordingly, counsel, taking into account all of the sentencing factors, it is my intention to impose a sentence of 405 months on Counts 5, 6, 8 and 9 to run concurrently, 204 months on Counts 2 and 3 for a total of 405 months.

It is my intention to impose a period of three years of surprised release on Counts 2 and 3, five years on Counts 5, 6, 8 and 9 to run concurrently for a total of five years.

It is not my intention to impose a fine.

It is my intention to impose the amount of \$550,000 in restitution as set out by the presentence report, and thanks to Mr. DeMarco's submission on behalf of Maersk lines \$550,000 is estimated to be the unreimbursable costs incurred by the Maersk line in connection with these unfortunate activities.

It is also my intention to impose the mandatory \$600

special assessment.

It is my intention to accept the suggested special terms and conditions of supervised release, including providing access to financial information, not opening lines of credit, et cetera, unless in compliance with the installment payment schedule, undergoing substance abuse treatment, obeying the immigration laws and submission to a search.

It is also my intention to adopt the restitution plan set out at page 38 of the presentence report.

Counsel, is there any reason such a sentence should not be imposed?

24 | 25 |

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

1	MR. WEINSTEIN: No, your Honor.
2	MR. McGUIRE: No, your Honor.
3	MS. DOHERTY: Your Honor, we may just have one
4	request.
5	THE COURT: But of course.
6	MS. DOHERTY: Just about the designation issue. I
7	don't know if this is now appropriate.
8	THE COURT: May I turn to you for that in just a
9	moment, please.
10	MS. DOHERTY: Thank you, your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Doherty.
12	Mr. Muse, you are sentenced, sir, to a period of 405
13	months incarceration on Counts 5, 6, 8 and 9, 204 months on
14	Counts 2 and 3 for a total of 405 months incarceration.
15	Following that period you will spend a period of five years on
16	supervised release on Counts 5, 6, 8 and 9, three years on
17	Counts 2 and 3 for a total of five years of supervised release.
18	During that period you will comply with all of the
19	standard terms and conditions of supervised release. Among
20	them are that you not commit another federal, state or local
21	crime; you not illegally possess a controlled substance; and
22	you not possess a firearm or other destructive device.
23	In addition to those and all of the other standard
24	terms and conditions of supervised release you will provide the
25	probation officer with access to any requested financial

information. You will not incur any new credit charges or open any additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer unless you are in compliance with the installment payment schedule for restitution.

You will participate in a program approved by the probation officer for substance abuse. That program will include testing to determine whether you have used drugs or alcohol.

The court authorizes the release of available drug treatment evaluations and reports to the substance abuse treatment provider as approved by the probation officer.

You might be required to contribute some or all of the costs of the program depending on your ability to pay and the availability of third party payment.

Also during the periods of supervised release you will obey the immigration laws of this country and comply with all directives of the immigration authorities.

During that period you will also submit your person, residence, place of business, vehicle or any other premises under your control to a search on the basis that the probation officer has reasonable belief that contraband or evidence of a violation of the conditions of your relation may be found there.

The search must be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner. Failure to submit to such a search may

be grounds for revoking your supervised release.

It is your obligation to inform other residents of the premises that the premises might be subject to a search under this condition.

As I noted, I do not impose a fine, but I impose the restitution amount of \$550,000 to be paid to the clerk of the court, United States District Court, 500 Pearl Street, New York, New York. From time to time the clerk will disburse amounts to Maersk Lines.

During the period of incarceration if you are engaged in a Bureau of Prisons non-UNICOR work program you will pay \$25 per quarter toward criminal financial penalties. If you participate in the Bureau of Prisons UNICOR program at a grade 1 through 4, you will pay 50 percent of your monthly UNICOR earnings toward the civil financial penalties consistent with Bureau of Prisons regulations at 28 C.F.R., Section 545.11.

And finally, sir, I impose the mandatory \$600 special assessment and that should be paid promptly.

Following release, restitution payments shall be paid in monthly installments also to the clerk of court at a rate no less than ten percent of your gross monthly income.

It is my duty to inform you, sir, that unless you have waived it, you have the right to appeal this sentence and you might have the right to appeal in forma pauperis, which means as a poor person with the waiver of certain fees and expenses.

Ms. Doherty, you wish to speak about a designation?		
MS. DOHERTY: Yes, your Honor. We just ask		
respectfully that the court make a number of recommendations to		
the Bureau of Prisons.		
First, that if possible, consistent with security		
needs, that he be housed with other Somali speaking inmates.		
Then that he would receive mental health treatment and		
also educational opportunities, including most significantly, I		
think English language instructions to lessen his isolation		
over these years.		
THE COURT: It is so recommended.		
MS. DOHERTY: Thank you, your Honor.		
THE COURT: Is there anything further, ladies and		
gentlemen?		
MR. McGUIRE: Your Honor, just two very minor issues.		
With respect to restitution, if your Honor permits,		
probation has provided the government with the address to which		
the clerk		
THE COURT: Would you read it out?		
MR. McGUIRE: I will put it into the record.		
Restitution should be directed to the following		
address:		
Maersk Line Limited, One Commercial Place, 20th floor,		
Norfolk, Virginia 23510-2103 with the notation Maersk Alabama		
restitution.		

1	And the second issue, your Honor, is the government
2	would respectfully move now for the dismissal of the four open
3	counts against the defendant.
4	THE COURT: So ordered.
5	Anything else, ladies and gentlemen?
6	MS. DOHERTY: No, your Honor.
7	MR. McGUIRE: No, your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Counselor, thank you for your excellent
9	presentations.
10	Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	